	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/016,282	KONOWALCHUK ET AL.		
Examiner-induced interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	San-ming Hui	1617		
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_		
(1) <u>San-ming Hui</u> .	(3)			
(2) Ms. Emily Holiday, attorney of record.	(4)			
Date of Interview: 2 September 2005	Time:			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:				
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed:				
Claims discussed: Prior art documents discussed:		·		
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet				
Part III.				
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview		
inhupt 7/15/05				
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Signature	gnature – if appropriate)		

•	Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413B)	Application No.	10/016,282

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Ms. Holiday informed the examiner that no reply was filed to the outstanding office actio mailed 2/8/05. It is because no office action was received that may be due to the transfer process. The applicant will consider file petition to revive the case since the no-reply is inadvertent.